

Serial No. 10/774,440
August 23, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005
Page 8 of 13

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-23 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 and add new claims 20-23.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11-14, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Uchida et al. (U.S. 6,079,099). Claims 5, 8-10, 15, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-19.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“An integrated electronic component comprising:
a ceramic substrate including circuit elements and external electrodes disposed on side surface of the ceramic substrate; and
a metal case having a top segment and substrate-facing segments and being mounted on the ceramic substrate; wherein
bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments oppose a top surface of the ceramic substrate, the substrate-facing segments have notches at positions opposing corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate, and the notches have a tapered shape having obtuse angles with respect to the bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments; and
the external electrodes are not disposed in the corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate.” (emphasis added)

Claim 11 recites features that are similar to the features recited in claim 1, including the above-emphasized feature.

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 11, including the features of “bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments oppose a top surface of the ceramic substrate, the substrate-facing segments have notches at positions opposing corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate, and the notches have a tapered shape having obtuse angles with respect to the bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments” and “the external electrodes are not disposed in the corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate,” Applicants have been able to provide an integrated electronic component whose ceramic substrate is not damaged by

Serial No. 10/774,440
August 23, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005
Page 9 of 13

external force applied to the metal case (see, for example, the third full paragraph on page 2 of the originally filed specification).

The Examiner alleged that Uchida et al. teaches all of the features recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 11, including a metal case having a top segment and substrate-facing segments, wherein bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments have notches at positions opposing corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended to recite the feature of "the external electrodes are not disposed in the corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate."

In contrast, as shown in Fig. 1 of Uchida et al, in the embodiment of Uchida et al. in which the notches are provided at positions opposing the corners of the substrate 20, the external/terminal electrodes 26 of Uchida et al. are disposed at all four corners of the top surface of the substrate 20. Thus, Uchida et al. fails to teach or suggest the features of "bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments oppose a top surface of the ceramic substrate, the substrate-facing segments have notches at positions opposing corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate, and the notches have a tapered shape having obtuse angles with respect to the bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments" and "the external electrodes are not disposed in the corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate" as recited in Applicants' claims 1 and 11.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Uchida et al.

In anticipation of the Examiner changing the rejection of claims 1 and 11 to a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Uchida et al., Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to modify the device of Fig. 1 of Uchida et al. so as to include external electrodes that are not disposed in the corners of the top surface of the substrate.

Although Fig. 4 of Uchida et al. shows an embodiment in which a substrate 320 includes external electrodes 326 that are not disposed in the corners of the top surface

Serial No. 10/774,440
August 23, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005
Page 10 of 13

of the substrate, in this embodiment of Uchida et al., the notches are not disposed at positions opposing corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate. In each and every embodiment disclosed in Uchida et al., the notches are disposed at the same location as the external electrodes. Uchida et al. fails to teach or suggest that the notches could or should be located at different locations from the external electrodes.

In fact, in Uchida et al., the notches are provided to prevent unwanted conduction between the metal case and the external electrodes. Thus, the notches must be located at the same locations as the external electrodes in order to perform their intended function. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that it would not have been obvious to modify the device of Fig. 1 of Uchida et al. so as to include external electrodes that are not disposed at corners of the top surface of the substrate because such a modification would be unsatisfactory for the intended purpose of the notches of Uchida et al.

The Examiner is reminded that if the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984) and MPEP § 2143.01.

Claim 20 recites:

"An integrated electronic component comprising:
a ceramic substrate including circuit elements; and
a metal case having a top segment and substrate-facing segments and being mounted on the ceramic substrate; wherein
bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments oppose a top surface of the ceramic substrate, the substrate-facing segments have notches at positions opposing corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate, and the notches have a tapered shape having obtuse angles with respect to the bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments; and
a portion of a top edge of each of the substrate-facing segments is spaced from a bottom surface of the top segment."
(emphasis added)

Claim 22 recites:

Serial No. 10/774,440
August 23, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005
Page 11 of 13

"An integrated electronic component comprising:
a ceramic substrate including circuit elements; and
a metal case having a top segment and substrate-facing segments and being mounted on the ceramic substrate; wherein
bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments oppose a top surface of the ceramic substrate, the substrate-facing segments have notches at positions opposing corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate, and the notches have a tapered shape having obtuse angles with respect to the bottom edges of the substrate-facing segments; and
the metal case includes side segments, the substrate-facing segments are seamlessly connected to the side segments at positions opposing the corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate, such that the substrate-facing segments are supported at borders with the side segments in a cantilevered fashion." (emphasis added)

Claim 21 recites features that are similar to the features recited in claim 20, including the above-emphasized features, and claim 23 recites features that are similar to the features recited in claim 22, including the above-emphasized features.

As shown in Fig. 1B and as disclosed in the first full paragraph on page 7 of the originally filed application, a portion of a top edge of each of the substrate-facing segments 21c is spaced by spaces 21e from a bottom surface of the top segment 21a such that the substrate-facing segments 21c are supported in a cantilevered fashion by the borders with the side segments 21b.

In contrast, as clearly seen in Fig. 1 of Uchida et al., the substrate-facing segments (the vertically extending sidewalls) of the metal case 10 of Uchida et al. are attached to the top segment (the horizontally extending upper wall) of the metal case 10 along **the entire top edge** of each of the substrate-facing segments. No portion of the top edge of any of the substrate-facing segments is **spaced from** a bottom surface of the top segment, and no portion of the substrate-facing segments is supported in a **cantilevered fashion**.

Therefore, Uchida et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the feature of "a portion of a top edge of each of the substrate-facing segments is spaced from a bottom surface

Serial No. 10/774,440
August 23, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005
Page 12 of 13

of the top segment" as recited in Applicants' claims 20 and 21, and the feature of "the metal case includes side segments, the substrate-facing segments are seamlessly connected to the side segments at positions opposing the corners of the top surface of the ceramic substrate, **such that the substrate-facing segments are supported at borders with the side segments in a cantilevered fashion**" (emphasis added) as recited in Applicants' claims 22 and 23.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Uchida et al. fails to teach or suggest the unique combination and arrangement of elements recited in Applicants' claims 1, 11 and 20-23.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 11 and 20-23 are allowable. Claims 2-10 and 12-19 depend upon claims 1 and 11, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claims 1 and 11 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a Two-month extension of time, extending to August 25, 2005, the period for response to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005.

Serial No. 10/774,440
August 23, 2005
Reply to the Office Action dated March 25, 2005
Page 13 of 13

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 23, 2005


Attorneys for Applicant

Joseph R. Keating
Registration No. 37,368

Christopher A. Bennett
Registration No. 46,710

KEATING & BENNETT LLP
10400 Eaton Place, Suite 312
Fairfax, VA 22030
Telephone: (703) 385-5200
Facsimile: (703) 385-5080